

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 1, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 5 to 12, 15 to 20, 26, 27, 30 to 32, 35, 36, 43, 44, 53, 54, 57, 58 and 60 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, 26, 31, 35 and 43 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies and thoughtful treatment accorded Applicant's undersigned representative during the February 27, 2008 telephonic interview. This Amendment has been prepared based on the discussions and agreements reached during that interview and it is respectfully submitted that the following summarizes those discussions and agreements.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 11, 20, 26, 31, 35, 39 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that the specification fails to include a description of the negative limitations included in the claims. It is noted that the specification does describe displaying particular items that have been designated, while not displaying items that are not designated. That is, as discussed in the specification with regard to Figs. 8 and 10, items designated under "Display" are those designated as a display-target to be displayed, while items not designated under "Display" (e.g., "Product Name" in Fig. 8) are not displayed. However, when "Product Name" is designated as a sort-item in Fig. 8, it is made to be displayed in Fig. 10 even though it was not designated as a display-target item. Thus, the claims are believed to

fully comply with § 112, first paragraph and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5 to 7, 9, 11, 12, 15 to 17, 19, 21, 22, 25 to 27, 30 to 32, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, 44 and 53 to 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 7,072,067 (Leiman). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

As discussed during the interview, the invention provides for displaying a list of devices and various device information for devices on a network. In the invention, a plurality of records (each corresponding to a particular device) include a plurality of items (e.g., a device name, product name, network interface board name, location, network address, MAC address) and each item has corresponding device information. As seen in Fig. 8, a user designates one or more items that are to display-targets to be displayed in the device list. The display-targets in Fig. 8 that have been designated are “NETWORK I/F BOARD NAME”, “LOCATION”, “NETWORK ADDRESS”, and “MAC ADDRESS”. Note that, in Fig. 8, “PRODUCT NAME” is not designated as a display-target item. A device list is then generated and displayed to display the designated display-target items.

In addition to the designating display-target items, a user designates any one of the plurality of items as a sort-item. In Fig. 8, the user designates “PRODUCT NAME” as an item to be used for sorting the records. With this designation, the item “PRODUCT NAME” is set as an item to be displayed in the device list, even though it was not designated as a display-target item. Thus, as seen in Fig. 10, the item “PRODUCT NAME” is displayed in the device list. Additionally, the records are sorted according to

the designated sort-item “PRODUCT NAME”. As a result, even though the item “PRODUCT NAME” was not a designated display-target, it nonetheless is displayed in the device list. Accordingly, one unique feature of the invention is that the item designated as a sort-item, even though it has not been designated as a display-target item to be displayed on the device list, is nonetheless set as a display-target item and is displayed on the device list.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended Claim 1 is directed to a network managing method for providing a device list that includes a plurality of records, each record including a plurality of device information corresponding respectively to a plurality of items, and each of the plurality of items represents a kind of the device information included in each record, the network managing method comprising designating, from among the plurality of items, at least one display-target item to be displayed on the device list, wherein, from among the plurality of device information included in each record of the device list, device information corresponding to the designated display-target items are set to be displayed while the device information corresponding to the items not designated as a display-target item are not set to be displayed in the device list, and designating any one of the plurality of items, which were not designated as a display-target item, as a sort-item, wherein, based on the items designated as a display-target, a display order of the plurality of records to be included in the device list is rearranged according to a content of the device information corresponding to the designated sort-item, a setting step of setting the designated sort-item as a display-target item to be displayed in the device list even though the item has not been designated

as a display-target item in the designating step, a rearranging step of rearranging the records in the device list according to the content of the device information corresponding to the designated sort-item, and a display step of displaying the device list rearranged in the rearranging step, including the device information corresponding to the designated display-target items and the designated sort-item.

Claims 11 and 26 are apparatus and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

Claim 31 substantially corresponds to Claim 1 with one difference being that a data list is substituted in the claims for the device list. Claims 35 and 43 are apparatus and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 31.

The applied art of Leiman is not seen to teach the features of Claims 1, 11, 26, 31, 35 and 43, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of designating any one of the plurality of items, which were not designated as a display-target item, as a sort-item, wherein, based on the items designated as a display-target, a display order of the plurality of records to be included in the device list is rearranged according to a content of the device information corresponding to the designated sort-item, a setting step of setting the designated sort-item as a display-target item to be displayed in the device list even though the item has not been designated as a display-target item in the designating step, a rearranging step of rearranging the records in the device list according to the content of the device information corresponding to the designated sort-item, and a display step of displaying the device list rearranged in the rearranging step, including the

device information corresponding to the designated display-target items and the designated sort-item.

Leiman is merely seen to disclose an open printing system in which a user can view a print queue of a selected printer. As seen in Fig. 9, a display contains various printers on a network and a user can select one of the printers from the display. Utilizing the drop-down menu, the user can select “View” from the drop-down menu and can then select one of various options to view. One option is to view the “Job Queue” for the selected printer. Upon selecting “Job Queue” from the drop-down menu, a listing of all jobs in the job queue are displayed. The user can then sort the displayed jobs by again selecting “View” from the drop-down menu, whereby the user can select one of various sorting criteria. As seen in Fig. 10, the user can select options to sort the jobs shown in the display “By Class”, “By Priority”, “By Source”, etc. Upon selecting one of the viewing (sorting) criteria from the drop-down menu, the jobs displayed for the job queue are rearranged according to the selected criteria. Thus, in Leiman, all jobs pending in the job queue are displayed and the user then selects a sorting criteria. In contrast, in the invention, the user selects at least one display-target item, which results in only those selected display-target items being displayed rather than all items being displayed. Some items, therefore, may not be selected as a display-target item and therefore, will not be displayed. When the user selects a sort-item, if that sort-item was not designated as a display-target item, it is nonetheless displayed and the displayed items are sorted accordingly. These features are not seen to be taught by Leiman.

During the interview, the Examiner pointed to Fig. 18 as an example of setting display criteria in Leiman. According to the Examiner, a user of Leiman can select one set of display criteria in Fig. 18, which he alleged corresponds to the claimed first designating step, and can then select another set of display criteria in Fig. 18 by choosing a criteria that is not displayed based upon the first selection, which he alleged corresponds to the claimed second designating step. That is, since the prior version of the claimed invention included two different and distinct designating steps, Leiman was alleged to perform the function of each step individually. As for the rearranging of records, the Examiner contended that the second selection naturally results in a new display and that the displayed information is naturally sorted (arranged) based on the display criteria. It is noted however, that in the invention, which of the designated display-target items that are not designated are to ultimately be displayed is dependent upon which of the non-designated display-target items are designated as a sort-item. In contrast, in Leiman, while the user can change the sorting criteria, it does not change which items are already displayed since the user selects the job queue, whereby all jobs are displayed, and then the user selects a sorting criteria, which does add an item corresponding to the sorting criteria to the items displayed. Thus, it is believed that the claims are allowable over Leiman.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, amended independent Claims 1, 11, 26, 31, 35 and 43, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2011031v1